

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:
DATE FILED: 11/22/2023

-----X
GRAHAM CHASE ROBINSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

ROBERT DE NIRO and CANAL PRODUCTIONS,
INC.,

Defendants.
-----X

CANAL PRODUCTIONS, INC.,

Counterclaim-Plaintiff,

-v-

GRAHAM CHASE ROBINSON,

Counterclaim-Defendant.
-----X

LEWIS J. LIMAN, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff Graham Chase Robinson (“Plaintiff”) moves: (1) to maintain under seal Trial Exhibits 76 and 82 of defendants Robert De Niro (“De Niro”) and Canal Productions, Inc. (“Canal” and together with De Niro, “Defendants”), filed in connection with Plaintiff’s *Motions in Limine*, Dkt. No. 438; (2) to file Plaintiff’s Trial Exhibits 99, 139, and 195 with limited redactions, Dkt. No. 451; and (3) to file Plaintiff’s Trial Exhibits 98 and 156 with limited redactions, Dkt. No. 457. Plaintiff also requests that the Court order the parties to file on the docket their respective Trial Exhibits with the redactions employed at trial, subject to two

19-cv-9156 (LJL)

ORDER

exceptions for sensitive exhibits. Dkt. No. 503. Plaintiff's motions are granted in part and denied in part.

"The common law right of public access to judicial documents is firmly rooted in our nation's history." *Lugosch v. Pyramid Co. of Onondaga*, 435 F.3d 110, 119 (2d Cir. 2006). The court considers three factors in determining whether to grant a motion to seal: (1) whether the record at issue is a judicial document; (2) the weight of the presumption of access to the judicial document; and (3) whether there exist countervailing factors that weigh against the presumption of access. *Stafford v. Int'l Bus. Machines Corp.*, 78 F.4th 62, 69–70 (2d Cir. 2023). A court may maintain materials in court filings under seal only after "review[ing] the documents individually" and making "'specific, on-the-record findings that sealing is necessary to preserve higher values.'" *Brown v. Maxwell*, 929 F.3d 41, 48 (2d Cir. 2019) (quoting *Lugosch v. Pyramid Co. of Onondaga*, 435 F.3d 110, 124 (2d Cir. 2006)).

The Court has reviewed each of the documents at issue in Plaintiff's motions. The motion at Dkt. No. 438 is granted in part: Defendants' Trial Exhibit 76 may be maintained under seal, while Defendants' Trial Exhibit 82 should be filed with email addresses and telephone numbers redacted. The motions at Dkt. Nos. 451 and 457 are granted in full. The Court denies, however, Plaintiff's request that the Court order the parties to file on the docket their respective Trial Exhibits with the redactions employed at trial. Dkt. No. 503. The Courtroom was open for members of the public at large to attend the Trial, at which they could freely view and take notes on the Trial Exhibits. Thus, the public at large did have a right of access to evidence introduced in the Trial. The Court therefore declines to order the parties to file their Trial Exhibits on the docket.

The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to close the motions at Dkt. Nos. 438, 451 and 457.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 22, 2023
New York, New York

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'L. Liman', is written above a horizontal line.

LEWIS J. LIMAN
United States District Judge